

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, 9, and 18-20 have now been amended. Dependent claims 3 and 11 have now been canceled. No new matter has been added.

Summary of Examiner Interview

On June 7, 2010, an examiner interview was conducted between Examiner Hadi Armouche and Applicant's representative, Mr. P. Raymond Chen. Applicant thanks the Examiner for extending the courtesy of the interview.

During the interview, amendments to independent claims 1 and 9 as presented herein were discussed. The Examiner advised Applicant to further clarify the distinctions between amended claims 1 and 9 and the combination of the references cited against dependent claim 4 in the Final Office Action, in particular, the Crane reference (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,236). The Examiner indicated that the amendments would overcome the existing prior art rejections, but that the amendments would require a new search.

Response to Objection to Specification

The specification was objected to because of informalities. It was alleged in the Final Office Action that Figure 1 shows that the connection 14 is connected with network user 1e

whereas paragraph 0039 of the specification teaches that the connection 14 is connected with network user 1c. See the Final Office Action, page 3, paragraph 6.

It is believe that in objecting to the specification, the Final Office Action intended to refer to paragraph 0037 in stead of paragraph 0039 of the specification. Therefore, paragraph 0037 of the specification has been amended to address the alleged informalities. Specifically, paragraph 0037 of the specification has now been amended to recite “for example, via communication connection 11, network 2 and connection 14, to a network user 1e who has also registered with the method.” Support for the amendment can be found in Figure 1 of the drawings as originally filed and the PCT priority application (PCT Application No. PCT/DE03/04190). Therefore, no new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Response to Claim Objections

Claims 19 and 20 were objected to because of certain informalities. These claims have now been amended to address the examiner’s concerns. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully requested the objections to claims 19 and 20 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 9-11, 15-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,444,780 of Hartman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,590,981 of Fruehauf et al. (“Fruehauf”) and in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,188 of Sinha et al. (“Sinha”). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,236 of Crane et al. (“Crane”). Claims 5-8 and 12-14

were rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,982,506 of Kara. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha in view of U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0019933 of Friedman et al. ("Friedman").

Claim 1 of the present application has now been amended so as to recite "the central system comprising a plurality of clock systems, wherein each of the plurality of clock systems of the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users," "identifying, by the central system, one of the plurality of clock systems thereof uniquely assigned to the network user," and "synchronously creating the at least one key by the clock system of the central system uniquely assigned to the network user and a clock system of the network user corresponding to the uniquely assigned clock system of the central system." Similarly, claim 9 of the present application has now been amended so as to recite "the central system comprising a plurality of clock systems," "each of the clock systems at the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users," "the clock system of each network user and the respective clock system of the central system are configured to operate synchronously so as to create at least one changeable key," and "the central system is configured to receive a request from one of the plurality of network users and encrypt a time signal using the at least one changeable key obtained from one of the plurality of clock systems uniquely assigned to the network user." Support for these amendments can be found in Figure 1 of the drawings and the specification at, for example, ¶¶ 0031-0037. It is respectfully submitted that Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a central system comprising a plurality of clock systems and a plurality of network users, each comprising a clock system, wherein each of

the plurality of clock systems of the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users for synchronously create a key for the network user as now recited in claims 1 and 9, respectively.

As the Final Office Action conceded, neither Hartman nor Fruehaul teaches or suggests “each of the plurality of clock systems of the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users.” See March 9, 2010 Final Office Action, page 4, sixth paragraph. With regard to Sinha, that reference also fails to teach, or suggest a central system comprising a plurality of clock systems, wherein each of the plurality of clock systems of the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users. Sinha merely describes a system having a source clock CNet_A 104 corresponding to a plurality of users 124, 126, and 128, each having a clock CNet_D 132. See Sinha, Figure 1 and column 5, lines 2-32. That is, in the system of Sinha, a source clock is not uniquely assigned to a user, but rather assigned to a plurality of user. Contrary to the assertions in the Final Office Action (see March 9, 2010 Final Office Action, page 5, first paragraph), Sinha thus does not teach or suggest “the central system comprising a plurality of clock systems, wherein each of the plurality of clock systems of the central system is *uniquely assigned* to one of the plurality of network users” (emphasis added) as now recited in claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, a combination of Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha, to the extent proper, could not render independent claims 1 and 9, nor their respective dependent claims obvious.

Regarding Crane, Friedman, and Kara, it is respectfully submitted that these references singly or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-recited features of independent claims 1 and 9 missing from Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha. In particular, Crane describes an

authentication system for authenticating a client using an authentication sever. Crane merely suggests “the applicant server determines which device authentication sever the request is intended for, and then forwards authentication data in the request to that sever.” See Crane, Abstract. Crane fails to teach or suggest at least “each of the plurality of clock systems of the central system is uniquely assigned to one of the plurality of network users” as now recited in independent claims 1 and 9. For at least this reason, Crane fails to cure the defects of Hartman, Fruehauf, and Sinha. It is respectfully submitted that respective combinations of Hartman, Fruehauf, Sinha, Crane, Friedman, and Kara, to the extent proper, could not render independent claims 1 and 9 and their dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10, and 12-20 obvious.

Reconsideration of the respective rejections of pending claims 1-2, 4-10, and 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on respective combinations of Hartman, Fruehauf, Sinha, Crane, Friedman, and Kara is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing it is believed that claims 1-2, 4-10, and 12-20 are in condition for allowance and it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered and that all pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue.

If there are any other issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any unpaid fees deemed required in connection with this submission, including any additional filing or application processing fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or 1.17, or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 121216.

Dated: June 9, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833

LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.

180 N. Stetson Ave.

Suite 4900

Chicago, IL 60601

(312) 616-5600

(312) 616-5700 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant(s)